

BONDAGE

A

MORAL INSTITUTION,

SANCTIONED BY THE

SCRIPTURES

OF THE

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

AND THE

PREACHING AND PRACTICE

OF THE

SAVIOR

AND HIS APOSTLES.

By A SOUTHERN FARMER.

MACON:

PRINTED BY GRIFFIN & PURSE.

1837.

BONDAGE
A
MORAL INSTITUTION,
SANCTIONED BY THE
SCRIPTURES
OF THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS,
AND THE
PREACHING AND PRACTICE
OF THE
SAVIOUR
AND HIS APOSTLES.

By A SOUTHERN FARMER.

Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God and man was a slave-owner *Genesis* 14; 14.

The best man that the Saviour found in all Israel was a slave-owner. *Matt.* 8; 10
St Paul rejoiced that there was a hope laid up in heaven for slave-owners. *Colossians* 1; 1, 3.

MACON:
PRINTED BY GRIFFIN & PURSE.
1837.

2700
2799
- 2600
1727

To the honest **YEOMANRY** of the South-
ern States, the following pages are dedicated by
their fellow-citizen,

THE AUTHOR.

[COPY RIGHT SECURED.]

BONDAGE

A

MORAL INSTITUTION.

WHEN the destiny of millions is suspended on the adoption of a sentiment said to be *moral*, it becomes the duty of the most humble citizen to enquire whether *indeed* it be founded on truth. That such a sentiment pervades our country, is obvious to all who have read the moral essays of the Abolitionists, and marked their unhallowed influence on the minds of the credulous. No circumstances however delicate, nor events however perilous, have prevented them from affirming that “neither the New-Testament Scriptures, nor the preaching and practice of our Lord and his Apostles will justify slavery.” Nor have they been idle in their efforts to secure the patronage of the virtuous and talented in the publicity of the sentiment. The Press has announced it as *sacred truth*—the minister of God has hailed it as the messenger of Heaven to the slave; and the Statesman has laid it on the Altar of his country, invoking the genius of Liberty to sanctify the offering. Under such circumstances, modesty would seem to forbid the humble farmer to utter a word; but viewing the sentiment as a reflection on the *wisdom* and *piety* of our fathers who framed the Constitutional

Compact of our country, he could not subscribe to the *sacredness* of its character, until he had searched the Scriptures and found it written in letters intelligible. He has searched them most carefully and the result of his researches is offered to the public in the following pages.

In the adoption of the sentiment "*neither the New Testament Scriptures, nor the preaching and practice of our Lord and his Apostles, will justify slavery,*" the votaries of emancipation seem to have lost sight of the conflict with which it involves the moral laws of the Old and New Testaments. The words are so arranged as to admit the conclusion, that the Old Testament Scriptures *do justify* slavery; and if according to their declarations, "*Slavery is a moral evil, for which humanity blushes and the angel of mercy weeps*" then the moral law of the Old Testament sanctions a moral evil, which humanity, mercy and the New Testament Scriptures condemn. Nor does the absurdity of the sentiment rest here—it implies that the HOLY TRIUNE GOD who inspired the patriarchs and prophets with the purest principles of piety, did not only permit *them* to live in the perpetration of the moral evil, but decreed, that for "*the poor unfortunate slave,*" the dictates of humanity should not be felt, nor the voice of mercy heard, until the days of the Abolitionists: for Abraham, with all his sterling virtues and holy faith, seemed to have been a stranger to the warm pulsations of *that humanity* with which *their* bosoms throb; and the angel of mercy who permitted him to bequeath his bond-servants to Isaac and sustained his immortal spirit in its last conflict, must either have *forgotten* to admonish the Patri-

arch of the *wicked deed*, or reserved for the present generation, the more melting sounds of his voice : strange divinity this, but it is as plainly written in the moral essays of the Abolitionists, as the perpetual bondage of the descendants of Ham is revealed and sanctioned in the Holy Scriptures.

Moses, we are told, possessed in an eminent degree the principles of philanthropy. He communed with His maker, and on the Holy Mount where he was consecrated the first Law-giver of the human family, received such instructions as INFINITE WISDOM perceived would best promote their present and future happiness. And did he grant unto the Israelites the moral right to hold the descendants of Ham in bondage? hear his words : “ And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying : if thy brother that dwelleth by thee, be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant ; but as a hired servant, and a sojourner, he shall be with thee and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee ; and then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.

Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the Heathen that are round about you ; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall you buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land : and they shall be your possession : and ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit for a possession ; they shall be your

"bondmen forever." * Can language be more emphatic than this? where in all the vocabularies of earth can words be selected, which more clearly justify *perpetual bondage*? But we are told that the word *forever* with which this moral and legal instrument concludes, "should not be construed *literally* but *definitely*, for the institution of Jubilee was specially designed to break the fetters of bondage." By what authority this remark can be applied to the descendants of Ham, we are at a loss to conjecture. With the most careful perusal of the writings of Moses and the Prophets we have not been able to discover any other distinction between the bondage of the poorer class of *Israelites* and that of the *Heathen* and *Stranger*, than is recorded in the words we have quoted: the *former* were released from their bonds in the year of Jubilee, but not the latter; thus fulfilling as early as the days of Moses, and from thence to the present period, the dying but prophetic words of the Patriarch Noah, "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." †

But "this distinction between the creatures of a just and merciful creator," is said to be "at war with all his moral attributes, consequently slavery cannot be right." That such an objection, involving so many extremely delicate illusions, should be offered by those who have but little regard for either the attributes of Deity or the precepts of his word, is not astonishing; but that it should be advocated by those who minister at the Altar, and whose business is to defend the pre-

* Leviticus, Chapter 25.

† Genesis, Chapter 9: v. 27

cepts and institutions of the Bible, is truly marvelous. If the distinction on which the objection rests be a reflection on the attributes of Deity, it is also a reflection on his *word* and *will* which sanction it; consequently, his word and will are arrayed against his attributes, by the moral logic of the Abolitionists. A sad dilemma this in which the Priests have involved themselves, for they have invariably taught us that there is no conflict whatever between the *word* and *will*, and *attributes* of Jehovah, but the most perfect harmony; otherwise the whole moral Code would be imperfect and consequently beneath the esteem of man. If this be *moral truth*, and who can doubt it? by what authority will they affirm that the bondage entailed on the descendants of Ham, under sanction of the *word* and *will* of God, "is at war with his moral attributes?" We leave the solution of this problem, to the morbid mind that conceived it, not however without a word in reply to the *objection* on which it is founded. That, we conceive, rests upon a contracted view both of the *agency* of man, and the *purposes* of Deity. If we seek instruction from the precepts of the moral law, we learn that the great Creator of the Universe is not accountable for that deficiency of human intellect, which distinguish so many of his creatures and from whence spring the ills of poverty and want: and from them we also learn, that in all the dispensations of a merciful providence, our eternal felicity is regarded with a more compassionate eye than our present comfort; hence the stations we occupy and the spheres in which we move, are not to be received as evidences either of his approbation or disapprobation. His om-

niscience is as boundless as his mercy, and if INFINITE wisdom perceived that the capacities of the "Heathen and Stranger" would not permit them to provide for their necessities, INFINITE MERCY could but provide masters for them, and if infinite wisdom perceived that the condition of bondage would better secure their eternal felicity, JUSTICE and MERCY could but sanction the deed.

With this view of the subject, we can perceive no conflict whatever between the word, and will, and attributes of Deity in the permission of slavery. Could it be proven that its subjects were thereby excluded from the means of grace and their condition rendered more intolerable by their bonds, the morality of the institution might be questioned; but the history of the Patriarchs and Prophets, is replete with evidences to the contrary of this, nor is there an instance recorded, of that rebellious spirit among their slaves, which is said to be produced "by the iron hand of bondage." They had once enjoyed freedom, and with all its "munificent gifts," they could but sip of the bitter cup of poverty and realize in the cries of their hungry little ones, its heart-rending ills—now, their bread was given them, their wants supplied, and they gave thanks to Heaven for the ample provision. Would they have exchanged their condition, for the privileges now granted to the peasantry of enlightened England? It is hardly probable: nor is it probable that the slaves of Baaz, would have exchanged their *servitude* for *that* imposed upon the hired servants of the Abolitionists. Why then should the voice of humanity be roused to plead the injustice of God and man in the institution of bondage?

Is it indeed an act of inhumanity to meliorate the condition of human beings? We appeal to reason and inspiration for the reply, and proceed to the second part of our argument.

If "*neither the New Testament Scriptures, nor the preaching and practice of our Lord and his Apostles will justify slavery,*" they must condemn it, and whatever our Lord and his apostles condemn, every good man should also condemn. Thus the Abolitionists reason, and according to their premises they reason correctly. But are the premises correct? We answer in the negative: there is not a precept in the writings of the Saviour and his Apostles which denounces the morality of the institution of slavery established in the days of Moses; on the contrary, we find the moral right to own slaves, justified by the act of the Saviour and his apostles receiving slave-owners in the church and greeting them as brethren in the faith. Can this be denied? In the face of truth and evidence, it has been denied: *some* of the philanthropists of the present age, have assumed the right to say that "the condition of the Roman slaves was nothing more than that of hirelings," and the more effectually to impose this specious illusion on the minds of the credulous, they have asserted that "the word *slave* appertaining to the condition of our slaves, is not to be found in the New Testament." Into what mazes of error may not the mind be driven in support of a false position. If the testimony of the best historians is to be rejected, if the "galling yoke of Roman bondage" of which they speak, be indeed an idle tale, we beg leave to ask the votaries of emancipation for a literal definition of

the original word, *Doulos*, translated *servant* in the Scriptures of the New Testament. We have endeavoured to consult the best lexicographers and from them we derive authority to say, that the more correct translation, is *slave*; and this opinion is sustained by the distinction which the sacred writers have invariably marked between the original words *Didaskalos* and *Despotas*, both of which are translated *master* in our version. In the Gospel recorded by the four Evangelists and in other parts of the New Testament Scriptures where the word master is used to designate a lord or officer of the Roman Empire, the original is *Didaskalos*; and wherever the word implies a relation to servants, the original is *Despotas*, the literal interpretation of which is a *Despot*, the peculiar characteristic of a Roman slave-owner. On such authority we assume our position; and until it can be proven that the whole Roman history is a farce and its authors deserve to be numbered among the fabulous, we shall continue to believe that St. Paul in the following words addressed slaves whose masters were members of the Church of Christ—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor; that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have *believing masters*, let them not despise them because they are Brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort." *

If we are not mistaken, these words of St. Paul were addressed to the slaves of Rome, by the hand of

* Timothy 6th Chapter 1-2.

Timothy, who was sent to visit them in the character of a missionary. The heart of the Apostle burned with a holy zeal for that class of human beings. The first to appeal to the humanity of their masters for their temporal comfort, he was not the last to cherish the most compassionate regard for their *eternal* felicity. Nor did he shrink from the duty of exposing the crimes of each. No circumstances, "neither stripes, nor bonds, nor imprisonment," could deter him from declaring "the whole counsel of God" and exposing the moral errors of man wherever he discovered them. What then but precepts of the purest morality could have been expected from him in a charge involving the eternal interests of the slave—Let us analyze his words, that we may correctly ascertain his view of their moral obligations to their masters. "*Let as many servants as are under the yoke*": what Yoke? surely it could not have been that of a hired servant, for the very introduction of the *word* in the sentence implies that there were two distinct classes of servants in Rome—one bond, and the other free—one under a yoke, and the other not—what then but the yoke of Bondage could the Apostle have meant? "*Count their own masters worthy of all honor*"—and could such masters as held their slaves in bondage contrary to the principles of humanity and "the Scriptures of the New Testament," have been *worthy* of all honor? Did the great Apostle of the Gentiles in all the purity of his heart and the light of his extraordinary learning, ever advance a sentiment so repugnant to the precepts of *morality* and the dictates of common sense? "*that the name of God and his doctrine be*

not blasphemed;” and could the name of God, and his doctrine, have been blasphemed by the disobedience of *freemen*, held in bondage contrary to “the Scriptures of the New Testament?” In the name of morality and consistency, we ask the question; where in all the sacred volume can be found a solitary sentence, representing the sons of freemen blaspheming the name and doctrine of God by contending for the birth-right of Liberty? Did not the Apostle himself contend for the liberty of a Roman citizen when his rights were assailed? If then the slaves of Rome whom he directed Timothy to admonish in the words we have quoted, where also entitled to the privileges of Roman citizens, by what principle of morality or consistency, could he have been justified for the act? It is indeed painful to see into what depths of error and inconsistency, the votaries of emancipation have thrown the sacred writers. No principle of humanity, patriotism, or virtue, could have sustained the Apostle in urging the most unqualified obedience on the slaves of Rome, if their masters had robbed them of their liberty or held them in bondage contrary to the precepts of the Bible.

We have already insinuated that St. Paul devoted much of his time to the instruction of slaves, and that he was by no means deficient in moral courage in his efforts to meliorate their condition. To their masters he applied the precepts of the moral law and urged them to be compassionate to their slaves. But where among all his precepts do we find a word on the subject of abolition? Did he shrink from the task fearing it might cost him his life? certainly not, for

that life he assures us, "*was hid with Christ in God*"--nor did he count it dear to him when he entered the Athenian Court, exposed the fallacy of Idol Gods, and planted within the walls of Infidelity the standard of the Cross. Whence that holy zeal and god-like magnanimity? surely from ardent desire to correct the moral errors of the Athenians which threatened their destruction. And was he less merciful to the slave-owners of Rome? Did he believe that the bonds of their slaves would expose them to the vengeance of Heaven, and yet was he silent? We cannot perceive the consistency of that logic, or the morality of that system of Ethics, which admits such conclusions. If timidity or partiality could have occupied any space in the bosom of the Apostle, surely the *former* would have yielded to the dictates of the *latter* in the case of Philemon. He was a fellow labourer in the Gospel and bound to him by the most sacred ties. To such a friend who possessed his entire confidence, he could freely have imparted his thoughts on the most delicate subjects; nor could he consistently with the duties of his apostolic office have refused to instruct him on a subject of so much interest as the bondage of his slaves. He did instruct him by the hand of his servant Onesimus, who had absconded from his master, and to whom he applied the precepts of the moral law on obedience and fidelity with such force, as to effect his conversion. Being fully persuaded of the sincerity of his repentance, he made him the bearer of a letter to his master, praying that he should be pardoned for his transgression.* Is it not marvelous that

*Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon.

the Apostle should have *entreated* Philemon not to punish the runaway, if he regarded it repugnant to the "Scriptures of the New-Testament," even for *such a master*, a minister of the Gospel, to punish such a slave? Could he have viewed the condition of the fugitive with the light reflected from the *great moral luminary* of the Abolitionists, rather would he have *concealed* him from the sight of his master, until he had sent up his PETITIONS to the *Senate* of Rome and the *Throne* of Heaven to release him from his bonds; but guided by the light of *INSPIRATION only*, he admonished him of having been an "*unprofitable servant*," and desired him to return to his master's service, with the best purposes of his heart to be "*profitable*" for the future.

No reproachful epithets did he cast on Philemon, nor did he insinuate that it was contrary to the precepts of the Bible or the duties of his sacred office to own a slave. *

"Servants," said the same Apostle, to the slaves at Colosse, "obey in all things, your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service as men pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong that he hath done. †

* In the election of Bishops at the last General Conference, the Northern Preachers were quite too *conscientious* to agree with St. Paul on this subject. As their tender feelings would not permit them to suffer "a slave owner" to exercise the Episcopal Office at the North, we hope they will favor us, in the future, with the services of Bishops SOTLE and ANDREW *only*. We want no Bishops in the South who assume more humanity and piety than St. Paul, and should the services of such be imposed upon us, we hope they will come prepared for a CATECHETICAL EXAMINATION, and for a CORROBORATORY DISMISSAL, in the event of their proving heterodox to the faith of the Apostles and the principles of the Constitution.

† Colossians, 3, Chap. 22, 23.

In this moral lesson, the slaves at Colosse were not only taught that the sincerity of their piety should be tested by their *obedience* and *fidelity* to their masters, but that the blessings of Heaven would be bestowed on *none* but faithful and obedient servants; and if their bondage was contrary to the will of God and “the Scriptures of the New-Testament,” we cannot perceive by what principle of morality the Apostle could have been justified for so teaching them. The Epistle, of which the words we have quoted compose a part, was addressed to members of the Church of Christ, and to such members as were called “*Saints and faithful Brethren*.” Astounding fact! that slave-owners should have been denominated Saints and faithful Brethren—and that too, by an Inspired Apostle. It is nevertheless true, and it is also true that such was the peculiar character of the Colossian slave-owners and their brethren. Their piety and simplicity of heart were known abroad, and having escaped the snares of “vain philosophy, traditions, and the worshiping of angels,” into which other members of the Church had fallen, the Apostle approved their fidelity and exhorted them to abide in the faith. Surely to such saints and faithful brethren he could freely have imparted his mind on slavery, and the more so, if he regarded it a “moral evil.” Why then was he silent? And why did he conclude his admonitions with the threat “but he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong he hath done.” If their masters kept them in bondage contrary to “the Scriptures of the New-Testament,” and their bonds prevented them from realizing the necessities of life and the moral enjoyments

of which their capacities were susceptible, they could not have done wrong by contending for their liberty, nor could St. Paul as an expounder of "the Scriptures of the New-Testament," have done right to teach them otherwise; but admit the conclusion, which is inevitable, that the condition of bondage was better adapted to their wants and capacities than any other, and by no means prevented them from the enjoyment of religious privileges, then is the lesson of the Apostle justified by every principle of humanity and moral truth.

No sentiment has saluted our ears more frequently, or with more pleasure from the sacred desk, than that which portrays the object of the Saviour's mission.

"He came the crimes of man to efface
And lift his immortal spirit to the skies."

It was for this purpose he came, says the minister at the North, and for this purpose did he come, says the minister at the South. Who then can doubt it? And who should presume to question his *moral ability* to accomplish the benevolent object? Surely those who greet in the holy sanctuary the votaries of emancipation, should be the last to advance a sentiment so extremely absurd. But is not the absurdity with which it is marked displayed in their moral essays on slavery? We think so: for if "*slavery be a crime for which humanity blushes, and the angel of mercy weeps,*" the Saviour did either not possess the moral ability to abolish it, or he did not possess the philanthropy to denounce it; for it is manifest that he did neither abolish the institution, nor denounce its advocates. What then is the conclusion? It should not be told but in terms of human compassion, for the heart sickens at the thought

of *that morality* which exalts itself above the Gospel, and *that philanthropy* which assumes more than the Saviour. It is not true that the Gracious Redeemer did not possess the moral ability to correct the errors of man, nor is it true that the measure of his *philanthropy*, was beneath the standard of his creatures. No circumstances nor events, neither principalities nor powers, could arrest his omnipotent arm in the accomplishment of his benevolent purposes. The rich and poor, the bond and free, were all permitted to hear the admonitions of his compassionate voice, in accents alternately gentle as the dews of Heaven. Nor were transgressors excluded from its hallowed influence. "I will have mercy," said he, "and not sacrifice ; for I am not come to call the righteous ; but sinners to repentance." Why then did he not address the slave owners of Rome, as sinners and transgressors of the Moral Law ? If he regarded slavery "*a moral evil and a curse to the poor,*" could he in the plenitude of his mercy have refused to admonish them of its baneful effects ? The poor, (and surely the Slaves of Rome were included among the number,) seemed to be the objects of his most tender regard. And did he look upon their bondage as "*a grievous burthen, a curse to their posterity,*" and an object of his compassion ? Certainly not, for where is recorded his compassion for their bonds ? And where in the spirit and words of the Abolitionists, did he rebuke their masters as "*cruel oppressors—tyrannical lords—destitute of the finer feelings of humanity.*" We have not found the semblance of such epithets in his admonitions, but in our research-

es for the truth on this subject, we found the Centurion,* one of the wealthy slave owners of Rome, beseeching the Saviour to come and heal one of his slaves afflicted with the palsy—his petition was granted, and the Saviour said of him, “I have not found so great faith; no, not in Israel”—How marvelous that the *best man* in all Israel should have been a slave owner—and how much more marvelous that the compassionate Redeemer should not have torn from the bosom of that honest slave owner, a principle opposed to “the Scriptures of the New Testament,” if indeed *slavery* was that principle—Away with the sentiment, “the finer feelings of humanity dwell not in the bosoms of slave owners.” The Saviour found in at least *one* of that class of human beings, all the virtues of the christian faith; and if an angel was now sent to select those from whose hearts the milk of human kindness pours its thousand streams of charity, we honestly believe that he would make his selection among the vilified “KIDNAPPERS OF THE SOUTH.” We may be regarded selfish in this opinion, but we have so often seen the hand of compassion and bounty extended to the aged, helpless slave, and the most menial offices performed for the comfort and happiness of *such objects* as are doomed in the “Classic land of Liberty,” to beg their crumbs in the Streets and Highways, we can but indulge it.

We have assumed the position that slavery *was* and *is* a merciful dispensation to that class of men

* See St. Matthew 8 Chapter, 9 verse, where the distinction of the terms *man* and *servant* is observed according to the custom of the Romans—the former denoting a soldier—the latter a slave.

who have neither the means nor capacities to provide for their wants; and our position is sustained, not only by the *moral truth*, that the Supreme Being is not accountable for the deficiency of the *means* and *capacities* of his creatures, but by the *passive* acknowledgment of the morality of the Institution observed by the Saviour in all his precepts. He is a merciful man, says the voice of Christianity, who meliorates the condition of his fellow men—hence, our Lord rebuked not the Centurion for holding his slaves in bondage, because their condition was thereby materially benefitted, nor did he forbid him to bequeath them to his posterity, in conformity with the Mosaic Law. “But he came not destroy, but to fulfill the Law,” say the Abolitionists, “consequently he could but be silent on the subject of slavery.” This is another of the many sophisms which seem to have been strained from the sacred Code, to mar the peace of the slave and excite his vindictive passions. It is true the Saviour came not to *destroy* the *Moral Law* delivered to Moses on Sinai, but every precept of the *Ceremonial Law* which he regarded contrary to the spirit of christianity he did abolish. And why? Because the *former* bore the impress of Deity, and was therefore perfect—the *latter* was a human production and therefore imperfect—and having come to correct the errors of man, he was bound by all his attributes to correct every immoral precept of the Ceremonial Law; accordingly, in his sermon on the Mount, particularly that part of it recorded in the 5th Chap. St. Matthew, he performed that office. And why may we ask, if he regarded slavery “*a moral evil*,” was it not inclu-

ded among the number of *moral evils* denounced on that solemn occasion? The descendants of Ham were then in bondage—and the poor Hebrew had not heard the glad sound of a Jubilee since the days of Nehemiah, a period of 415 years anterior to the christian era. Why was the compassionate Redemer silent on a subject so momentous? Was it because “his kingdom was not of this world,” as we have been told? True, his kingdom was not of this world, for his word assures us it was “a kingdom of *righteousness, joy and peace* in the Holy Ghost.” And who but the *righteous* could have been received as its subjects—who but the *righteous* could have been partakers of its joy and peace? The *Centurion* was not excluded, nor were the *saints* and *faithful Brethren* at Colosse. Were they received as *probationers* only until they had atoned for “*the accursed sin of slavery*?” Why then were not their privileges as subjects of that kingdom suspended on the emancipation of their slaves? Did the INFINITE WISDOM of the Saviour perceive that such an injunction would meliorate their condition and the condition of myriads yet unborn, but his INFINITE MERCY *could not* enforce it? Did his DIVINITY look through the events of distant ages, and perceiving that the present and future happiness of millions would be destroyed by the bonds of servitude, would fain have rebuked the world—but it was more than his HUMANITY could do? Did he indeed regard slavery, “*a reproach to christianity—a principle at war with every emotion of humanity and mercy*,” and refused to lift his voice against it? Was the measure of his compassion so far beneath the Ab-

olitionists that he could not utter a word of commiseration for the bonds of "*the Heathen and Stranger?*"—Well indeed may "*humanity blush*" at such a picture of the compassionate Redeemer—and well may "*the Angel of mercy weep,*" when within the temples of the MOST HIGH, it is engraven by the holy hand of Priesthood, and sent forth to rouse a rebellious spirit. It is not true that the Immaculate Saviour passed by "*the heathen and stranger*" as objects beneath his care—nor is it true that he reserved for the Satellites of Tappan and Garrison, that compassion for their bonds, which he could neither cherish himself, nor permit his Apostles to cherish. He beheld their condition—he looked to their future destiny, and viewing the events and calamities of ages and generations yet to come, he released them not from their bonds, because he regarded them essential to their wants—and he rebuked not their masters, because they were acting under the authority of a *moral Institution*, sanctioned by the precepts of a *moral law*.

With this view of the subject, (and we can perceive no other that does not represent the Almighty as an unjust, cruel tyrant, accountable for the incidental deficiencies of the means and capacities of his creatures,) it is obvious that "the New Testament Scriptures and the preaching and practice of our Lord and his Apostles" *do justify* slavery; and we will now enquire by what authority the Abolitionists have affirmed, that an institution stampd with the seal of Sinia—justified by the patriarchs and prophets, and sanctioned by the Saviour and his Apostles, "*is contrary to the SPIRIT of Christianity!*" The falla-

cy of the sentiment, when fairly presented, must be obvious to the most superficial reasoner ; but it is so often viewed in the *abstract*, and so long and repeatedly has it been acknowledged as *a self evident truth*, it has assumed the character of tradition, we will therefore examine its moral worth. And what is Christianity ? The religion taught by the Saviour. And what is the religion taught by the Saviour ? Repentance, faith and holiness ; the sincerity of which is exemplified by a due obedience to the precepts of the moral law. We have been taught no better definition of christianity than this, nor have we been able to learn that its *spirit* is a *separate immaterial particle*, inculcating precepts more moral and divine than *Christianity* itself. It cannot be true ; for if there be a moral principle in the *spirit* of Christianity that is not to be found in its *precepts*, it must require more than ordinary capacities to comprehend it : then is grace limited to the wise, and God is unjust by excluding the ignorant from its holy influence. We cannot believe it ; for the sublimity of the whole moral code, apart from its divine character, consists in the simplicity of its precepts ; and those precepts most happily adapted to every grade of human intellect, embrace not only the whole duty of man, but all that the *spirit* of Christianity can possibly inculcate ; hence saith the Apostle, "*there is one body, and one spirit,*" and inasmuch as the *spirit* of man is judged by the deeds of the law, so is the *spirit* of Christianity testified by the precepts of its author ; for "*as the body without the spirit is dead,*" so the *word* of God without the *spirit* of Christianity is dead also. There can be no

just distinction of the *terms*, for it is not possible to conceive an idea more absurd, than that of the Saviour and his Apostles inculcating precepts of moral obedience contrary to the *spirit* of Christianity. What, then, is the conclusion? It is this; that all the precepts of the Gospel addressed to the slaves of Rome, were not only consistent with the *letter*, but the *spirit* of Christianity, for “*the words that I speak*,” said the Saviour, “*they are SPIRIT, and they are LIFE.*”

With these reflections, we will now proceed to examine those precepts which were specially directed to masters. and such others as are conncted with them. St. Paul thus addressed the slaves at Ephesus and their masters: “Servants be obedient to your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart as unto Christ; not with eye service, as men pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your master also is in Heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him. Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.”* In these words the principles of obedience and humanity are enforced in a manner peculiarly emphatic, The slave is taught that to secure the approbation of his Heavenly Master, he must conscientiously discharge his du-

* Ephesians, Chap. 6, 5-10.

ties to his earthly master ; and his master is taught that if he would obtain the like favor, he must exercise benevolence and compassion to his slave ; and having thus discharged their duties to each other, they are exhorted to “ *be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.*” Whether it was possible for the master who held his slave in bondage contrary to the *word and spirit* of Christianity to *be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might* ; and whether the Apostle could have been justified for thus affectionately exhorting *such* a master, we leave the reader to determine. It is the opinion of a learned commentator, that the words “*forbearing threatening,*” were intended as a rebuke to such masters as were in the habit of using menacing language to their servants ; the act not being consistent with the *spirit* of Christianity, the Apostle admonished the Ephesians of its evil tendency. But here his admonition ended : they were his brethren in the church, and so much confidence had he in the sincerity of their piety, that he solicited an interest in their prayers.* Not a word did he utter on the subject of emancipation, nor did he insinuate that it was contrary to the *word or spirit* of Christianity, for the relation which *then* existed between masters and slaves to be *perpetuated*. The words “*for there is no respect of persons with him,*” which have been so cruelly tortured to prove the iniquity of slavery, refer specially to the *future and eternal inheritance*, which, without regard to poverty or wealth, freedom or bondage, is bestowed upon the virtuous. They can have no reference whatever to earth-

* Read the 6th chapter of Ephesians.

ly distinctions, for Moses was placed in a more exalted station than the rest of the Israelites by the special will of Heaven, Samuel also was anointed king by his MAKER'S permission, the priests and rulers were endowed with special privileges, and the Apostle himself enjoined it on the Romans "to render to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

"*Masters,*" said the same Apostle to the Christians at Colosse, "*give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a master in Heaven.*"* Dr. Clarke (who though not an Abolitionist, cherished against slavery the prejudices peculiar to the English,) admits that these words were addressed to the owners of slaves who are required by them to give their slaves *comfortable food, comfortable raiment and a reasonable task of labor*. This was what he conceived equivalent to their services, and justly due them. We have no objection to his opinion, nor do we believe a more correct exposition of the words can be given. They were addressed, as we before stated, to "the saints and faithful brethren" at Colosse, who enjoyed the entire confidence of the Apostle, and for whom he said "there was a hope laid up in Heaven." They contain his last admonition to masters, and the last that we have discovered in the New Testament. Is there a word in the sentence on the subject of emancipation? There is not —nor did the Apostle insinuate that it was inconsistent with the *spirit* of Christianity for *saints and faithful brethren* to hold their servants in perpetual bondage. Whence, then, have the Abolitionists derived

their authority for the declaration? Have they received a *special dispensation* of grace to which the Apostle was an utter stranger? Was it reserved for *their* lucid minds so thoroughly to explore the science of salvation, as to discover that on the subject of slavery, there is neither the *spirit* nor *life* of Christianity in the *words* of the Saviour and his Apostles? Would to God we could cover their daring arrogance with the mantle of charity, and attribute their unholy purposes to the spirit of fanaticism. But we cannot—the disturbing spirit has been roused, not by the credulous and visionary, but by the voice of learned priests—and those whom the Saviour and his Apostles approved as *saints* and *faithful brethren*, they denounce as “*unjust, cruel, kidnappers guilty of the most atrocious transgressions against God and man.*” Well for them—if after all their pious efforts to fill the coffers of monopolists, at the cost of the tears and blood of Southern slave owners, some Heavenly messenger shall greet them with the salutation of St. Paul to the slave owners at Colosse; “*We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have for all the saints, and for the hope which is laid up for you in Heaven.*”

It has been maintained by the Abolitionists, that St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians most unequivocally condemns slavery in the following words—“Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called *being* a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant,

is the Lord's free man : likewise also, he that is called, *being free*, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price ; be not ye servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide." We intend that a *trio* as worthy as Locke, Coke and Whitby shall expound these words. "*Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he is called*, desiring no alteration in his condition, but satisfied with the dispensations of God's providence—*Art thou called being a servant? care not for it* ; because thy condition as a servant or a slave is therefore not the less acceptable to God—but *if thou mayest be made free, use it rather* ; if thou canst obtain thy liberty by *righteous means*, it may be *lawful* for thee to desire it ; but if thou canst not, content thyself, and look not upon thy condition as a mark of God's displeasure—*For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's free man* ; brought from the bondage of sin to the most desirable freedom, the glorious liberty of the sons of God—*Likewise, also, he that is called being free, is Christ's servant* ; for whatever thy civil privileges may be, when thou hast taken the Lord for thy master, thou art as much bound to obey his commandments as the meanest slave—*Ye are bought with a price*, even the blood of Jesus—*be not ye the servants of men* ; in their ungodly practices and idolatrous worship, but serve the Lord thy God—*Brethren, let every man wherein he is called*, whatever his station in life may be—*therein abide with God*, resigned to his will and the dispensations of his providence"—We wish it distinctly understood that these reflections are from the pens of the learned and pious

who were free from what is called “the sin of slavery” and who had imbibed prejudices quite strong enough to permit them to discover some moral injunctions against it, if such were contained in the words. The Epistle from which the words are selected, seems to have been written by St. Paul in reply to a letter of consultation addressed him at Ephesus by some members of the Church at Corinth.* In the ardor of his holy zeal, he had visited all the Asiatic provinces of Greece and remained some time in the city of Corinth, then the capital of Achaia in the Peloponesus, where many were converted by his ministry, and whose partiality for him induced them to consult him on some important matters which occurred after his departure. Contests and divisions had arisen among them, and while some exclaimed “*I am of Paul*”—others, “*I of Apollos*”—and others, “*I of Cephas*,” a certain class contended that the privileges of their *christian state* and the franchises of the kingdom of Christ, had released them from the ties and obligations which had previously bound them as members of the *civil society*. To that class, the Apostle addressed the words we have quoted. They were servants, and it is obvious that they were servants of a peculiar class, otherwise they would have been admonished as were the servants of Ephesus and Colosse, for the Apostle could not have been *partial* and *just* also. The word, *Apeleutheros*, rendered freed man, in *Latin Libertus*—signifies says Locke, not simply a free man, but one who having been a slave, has had his freedom given

* The Reader is referred to the tenor of that part of the Epistle embraced in the 7 first Chapters for the proof of our remarks.

him by his master, and as the Grecians on special occasions liberated such slaves as had once enjoyed freedom, but by the fate of war had fallen under the yoke of bondage, and in that condition proved themselves worthy of their former state, the servants at Corinth contended (after their conversion) that their relation to their masters in the Church entitled them to like privileges. That such had been their fate and such their means and capacities, St. Paul believed, (as some of our Southern slave owners believe when they emancipate certain slaves) that they might be happier in a state of freedom, the words "*if thou mayest be made free, use it rather*" most conclusively imply, but nothing more—for the Apostle rebuked them as often as three times in the compass of seven verses for contending that Christianity either by the influence of its *spirit* or its *precepts*, gave them a *new* or *peculiar* liberty to change their condition, or imposed that obligation on their masters. And why may we ask did he withhold his admonitions to their masters if it were contrary to the *spirit* of Christianity for them to hold even *such servants* in bondage? The occasion was one of peculiar interest and must have enlisted the sympathies of his heart. As an umpire, a mediator and the spiritual father of both master and slave, his counsel was solicited on a subject embracing their present and future happiness. Behold my bonds and pity me, cried the slave—tell me my duty and I will perform it, responded the master. And what said the Apostle? "*Brethren, let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's free-*

man : likewise also, he that is called, being free is *Christs servant*." Such were his words. And where are those which breathe more of the *spirit* of christianity—where shall we find others that more clearly prove the compassion of its author? Shall we seek them in the crimson pages of a Garrison and his godly companions?—The words "*ye are bought with a price; b not ye the servants of men*" which they have vauntingly exclaimed, "prove the iniquity of slavery beyond the possibility of doubt," according to their hypothesis, impeach not only the consistency but the morality of the Apostle. For if they contain an admonition to servants and refer especially to the condition of bondage, why should St. Paul have charged the servants at Ephesus and Colosse to "*obey in all things their masters according to the flesh?*" St. Peter who partook of his spirit and seemed to have cherished no little concern for the moral instruction of the slaves at Galatia, thus addressed them:—" *Servants be subject to your masters, (de-potai) with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also the froward.*" For this is thank-worthy if a man for conscience towards God endure grief, suffering wrongfully—For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently? but if when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable to God."* We can perceive no morality or consistency in these and such admonitions as St. Paul addressed to the slaves of Ephesus and Colosse, if it were contrary to the express word of God for "*no man to be called the servant of another*" as the Abolitionists in-

form us, but reverse the position, and the Apostles are free from reproach.

We beg leave to compare the admonition of St. Peter with the *moral sentiments* of a learned priest of the Abolition School, which, if they did not procure him the degree of D. D. at least prevented him not from receiving it: "*slavery*," says the divine, "*is made up of every crime that treachery, cruelty and murder can invent; and slave owners, who are men stealers, are the very worst of thieves.*" *The most knish tricks are practised by those dealers in human flesh; and if slaves judge of our moral character by that of their masters, they must suppose that Christians are devils, and that Christianity was forged in hell. Can devils plot against us, worse than they do against them? In art and wickedness, as it respects principle and practice, their masters abundantly exceed.*" "Out of the abundance of the heart," said the Saviour, "the mouth speaketh;" we may therefore justly conclude, that there was *at least* as much of the *spirit* of piety in the heart of the writer, as in the words of his mouth. St. Peter, however, differed with the learned divine, for, among "the men stealers" of Galatia he found some whom he called *good and gentle—the people of God—elect through sanctification of the spirit*, and to whom he applied the Gospel salutation, "*brethren, grace unto you, and peace be multiplied.*" Strange indeed, that the Apostle should have been so charitable to "*thieves and murderers*," and still more strange that he should have rejoiced "*that there was reserved in Heaven for them, an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.*" We

had thought that the Heavenly inheritance was reserved for a different class of beings to those "*who are guilty of every crime that treachery, cruelty and murder can invent,*" and we still think so; but we are admonished by one of the *holy spirits* of the Abolition school, to be cautious how we form favorable opinions of the future happiness of slave owners, for if *his words* be true, what St. Peter said is false; moreover, the Apostle was not famed for much learning, and it could not be expected that a fisherman of Galilee could so comprehend the principles of *matter* and *spirit* as to discover the distinction between the *word* and *spirit* of Christianity. It may be true that the Apostle never received the honors of the *literati*, and we are sure it is true that he never studied the science of Abolition Divinity; but he learned at the lips of a Teacher, even the immaculate, omniscient Saviour, that "as the *body* without the *spirit* is dead," so the *word* of Christianity without its *spirit* is dead also: therefore, as the word of God justified slavery and promised an *eternal inheritance* to the merciful slave owner, the SPIRIT approved the deed—St. Peter rejoiced to proclaim it—and we are happy to believe it.

It has been asserted by some whose moral sensibility is not quite so austere as others, that "slavery is repugnant to the precept, *thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*" A contrary opinion is maintained by the best Commentators, who, to show the obvious meaning of the words, have thus transposed them, *as thou lovest thyself, so shouldst thou love thy neighbor.* The duties of religion, says Dr. Coke, "are all *relative*, regarding either God or man; and there is no *relative duty* which *love* does not readily transform it-

self into, upon the mere view of the *different circumstances* of the persons concerned. *Love*, with regard to a *superior*, becomes honor and respect—with respect to *equals*, it is friendship and benevolence, towards *inferiors*, it is courtesy and condescension. *Love* compels us to regard the person, property and character of our neighbor, and makes us ready at all times to do him service, and to act towards him in every situation as we would *reasonably* expect him to act to us, if he was in our circumstance.” Thus the master is impelled by this law of *love* to treat his slave with humanity and benevolence—not as his equal, for providence has drawn a line of distinction between them—not to emancipate him, for it is not written in the law of *love* that he should do so, nor has he just cause to believe that it would meliorate his condition. “But not so—away with your doctrine of distinctions,” exclaim the Abolitionists, “the words are to be construed literally, for God is no respecter of persons.” And if we are to love every member of the human family as *much* as we love ourselves, pray tell us what is to become of the law of *nature*, and of all the moral and endearing ties of life. How *unnatural* must be the feelings of that father who esteems his neighbor’s son as much as his own; and how more than *brutal* the affections of the mother who loves her neighbor’s child as tenderly as her own offspring. It cannot be true; for if this view of its moral influence be repugnant to nature, how much more appalling to behold the turmoils and jealousies it presents to the more delicate relations of life: for it is hardly probable that the *refined* Abolitionist (with all

his benevolent feelings for the slave) would be happy to believe that the sable son of the Ethiopia enjoyed quite as large a share of his wife's affections as she had reserved for her husband; and that his daughter, in all the delicacy of her nature, knew no difference in her esteem for the uncouth negro, than for the refined gentleman of her own color. Upon such premises, the doctrine of AMALGAMATION is based, which, though advocated by the *depraved* Garrison, and sanctioned by the suffrages of *honored* Senators as the *happiest method* to effect a general emancipation of our slaves, is nevertheless repugnant to every sentiment of refined humanity and moral truth. For when Ezra heard that the Israelites had taken the daughters of the Canaanites for their wives and the wives of their sons, the venerable old priest rent his garment and his mantle, and plucked off the hair from his head, exclaiming in the bitterness of his heart, "*O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God; for our trespass is grown up unto the Heavens, and LO!!! the PRINCES and RULERS of the people have been chief in the trespass.*"* Nor did the idea of the grovelling and demoralizing influence of the transgression originate with him; for Abraham who dwelt among the sable sons of Canaan, shuddered at the thought of Isaac's forming a connection with one of their daughters; for it is written that "when he was old, and well stricken in age, he said unto his eldest servant that ruled over all that he had; put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and I will make thee swear by the God of Heaven, and the God

of the earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell ; but thou shalt go unto my country and to my kindred, and take a wife unto Isaac my son.”* Nor was the thought less afflictive to the feelings of the chaste Rebecca, for when she heard that Esau had married the daughter of the Hittite, she exclaimed in the anguish of her heart, “I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth; if Jacob also take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these which are of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me.”† Moses also expressly commanded the Israelites to form no covenant with the tribes of Canaan—“thou shalt make no marriages with them; thy daughters thou shalt not give unto their sons, nor their daughters shalt thou take unto thy sons;”|| and it should not be forgotten, that for the violation of this command, it is written, “the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he sold them into the hands of the King of Mesopotamia,”‡ who held them in bondage eight years, as a punishment for indulging their beastly passion for amalgamation.

We have now reached that part of our argument which rests upon the Golden Rule, “*all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them ; for this is the law and the prophets.*” According to the exposition of the ABOLITION SCHOOLMEN, this passage of Holy Writ, paralyzes the energies of social and moral society and arrests the arm of civil authority in all criminal cases. The son, the

* Genesis 24, 14.

† Genesis, 27, 46. The reader is also referred to Genesis 10th chapter, for proof that the daughters of Heth were the descendants of Ham.

‡ Deuteronomy 7, 1 3.

|| Judges 3, 5 8.

pupil and apprentice, have a right to demand a release from the restraining obligations imposed upon them contrary to their will, and the thief, the murderer, and the wretch who prostitutes female innocence, when arraigned at the tribunal of justice, have only to appeal to the moral sympathies of the Judge and Jury with the prayer, "forgive us, *for even so would we do unto thee* if we were in thy circumstances," and they are morally bound to grant the prayer. And according to their exposition, the rich are required by these words to make such a distinction of their goods to the poor as to render their condition more than tolerable. They seem, however, to have forgotten that their hypothesis embraces more than Southern slave owners as transgressors of the precept, we therefore beg leave to illustrate the consistency of their exposition by an allegory.

A certain poor man at the North approached the dwelling of a wealthy Abolitionist and thus accosted him—Sir, I am poor and have no home for my family ; I would that thou shouldst give me a small portion of thy large estate, if it be but one of thy smallest farms, that I may the better provide for my *little ones*, and not be tortured in my last hour with the heart rending thought of leaving them to be fed by the cold hand of charity—do this I pray thee, *for even so would I do unto thee* if I were in thy circumstance. Now the poor man was silent for a while and likewise was the rich man, for the prayer of the suppliant had entered his ears, but the thought of granting it had not entered into his heart : wherefore the poor man importuned him again, and appealing to his own exposition of the

precept, and to his benevolence and his piety, he assured him that inasmuch as he possessed a more abundant store of goods than his wants required, he could not consistently with the *spirit* of Christianity reject his prayer, for thus is it written "*having food & raiment, let us therewith be content.*" Now these words were received by the Abolitionist as something more orthodox than the prayer of the suppliant, wherefore he thus accosted him—friend, thou hast done well by reminding me of those words of St. Paul, for they were written specially for the poor, therefore take them to thyself—moreover, thy request is *unreasonable*, for if I were to grant unto thee what thou desirest, another and others would desire the same, and when I should have done likewise to them, then would I be left to pine in poverty also—furthermore, I would have thee know that I do no violence to the *spirit* of Christianity nor the precepts of the Bible by holding my wealth; for Abraham and Job and the Centurion and many others of old abounded in wealth, and it is said of them that they were the servants of God, yet they suffered not their charity to extend so far as to the giving away of their estates; nevertheless to the poor they were kind, and so I trust am I. Now when he had thus spoken, the poor man looked with indignant pity at the Abolitionist and answered him saying—and so, sir, Abraham and Job and the Centurion were quite orthodox in *thy faith* of not sharing their fortunes with the poor, but hast thou forgotten that a large portion of their wealth consisted in slaves? They were slave owners, Sir, "*base criminal kidnappers*" according to thine own words, "*who in art and wickedness exceed the*

devil" and wilt thou take such characters as ensamples of *thy* faith and practice in deeds of charity?—Consistency, sir, is a jewel that belongeth to the *philanthropist*, and if the measure of thy philanthropy be so vast as to embrace the poor sons of Ham who dwell in the South, how canst thou look with *pitiless concern* on the poverty and wretchedness of *thy* kindred of the Tribe of Japheth, who sojourn in the North? Wouldst thou know the burthen of my heart and the cause of these my tears? Go thou to the Alms House even of the great city of the North, and look at the pittance provided by the rich for the hungry poor who call for their morsel. And of what does it consist? Potatoes, sir, Potatoes—a scanty share of Potatoes. And is this the boon of thy charity that is to soothe a parents heart in his last hour? Knowest thou not, that thy most "*cruel kidnappers*" do more than this for their slaves? Go thou to the South and see the comforts of life which the *more humane* bestow on their servants of the Tribe of Ham, and not on them only, but on our kindred of the Tribe of Japheth. If thou wouldst find that charity which bids the poor man die in peace, go thou to Charleston the city of thy "*hard hearted men stealers*," and view their Orphan House filled with fatherless children, fed and clothed and *nurtured in the admonition of the Lord*—Go view the poor of the City and the Suburbs thereof, supplied abundantly and daily with the best of Bread and Flesh—see the physicians of skill and science employed to minister to the sick, and the great men of the City, like good Samaritans of old, alternately acting as Overseers of their cares and their wants without fee or reward—there

go, if thou wouldst find that charity which fair would wipe the tears that fall impitied at the door of thy dwelling. And wilt thou suffer those whom thou callest '*the most depraved of mankind*' to exceed thee so far in charity? In the name of thy *boasted philanthropy*, I adjure thee, go thou and do likewise, that the poor man of the North may also die in peace.—Now when he had thus spoken, the door of the Abolitionist was closed against the suppliant, for his heart sickened at the thought of the many virtues of his "*Southern kidnappers*," therefore he determined to hear no more of them.* Nor will we trespass any farther on his patience by seeking a just exposition of the precept in the consistency of his words and deeds: neither will we be our own expositor—we prefer offering the exposition of one who never advocated slavery, but who having viewed it in the *abstract*, imbibed prejudices quite as strong as the spirit of piety would permit him to indulge. "The words, says Dr. Doddridge, imply that we should treat men in every respect just as we would think it *reasonable* to be treated by them, if we were in their *circumstances* and they in *ours*; for this is in effect the *summary* and *abstract* of all

* There is not a City in the world where such ample provision is made for the Poor, and the Orphans of the Poor, as in Charleston. "Leave thy fatherless children with us," say the benevolent inhabitants to the Poor in their dying moments, "and we will teach them to fear God & walk uprightly." Thousands of such Orphans have been reared under the parental care of "THE HARD HEARTED KIDNAPPERS" of the Orphan House, all of whom have distinguished themselves for honest industrious habits; some are numbered with the most talented citizens of Carolina, and not one has ever been convicted of a penal offence. We have Institutions of a similar character but of less magnitude among us, and JOSIAH FLOURNOY ESQ. of Putnam, has recently contributed 40,000 Dollars to the Methodist Conference of Georgia, to aid in establishing a MANUAL LABOUR SCHOOL in which some Orphans are to be educated. Will not a few more of the GENEROUS BENEFACTORS of Georgia do likewise and enable the Conference to erect a Manual Labour School Asylum for all the POOR ORPHANS of the state?—What a vast amount of good would result from such an Institution, and how appropriately might the Epitaph of ATOIUS of Rhemis, be engraven on the tombs of such friends of God and man—"He exported his Fortune before him into Heaven by his charities, he is gone thither to enjoy it."

the moral precepts of *the law and the prophets*, and it was one of the greatest ends of *both* to bring men to this humane and equitable temper." Thus the master, like Abraham and the faithful of old, is required by this precept to treat this slave with all that humanity and benevolence with which he would wish his slave to treat him, provided their circumstances were reversed.

But what is the *measure* of that humanity and benevolence, and how shall it be meted to the slave? The Jews understood it to embrace all that was written concerning humanity and benevolence in the *law and the prophets*, for the precept was familiar to them, being one of their own maxims* and Wetstein and Grotius inform us that some of the Heathen writers so understood it; but the Abolitionists have discovered that the *spirit* of Christianity is not to be found in *the law and the prophets* concerning slavery, consequently they reject the construction. The Saviour, however, perceiving in the plenitude of his wisdom that the members of civil society would be disturbed by the discordant opinions of such extraordinary teachers, expressed the precept in words so plain as to permit even the Heathen to perceive that it embraced nothing more than was written in *the law and the prophets*; therefore, if the master would learn how far his humanity and benevolence should be extended to his slave, and if the slave would know how far his obedience and fidelity should be extended to his master's precepts and interest, let them both go to *the law and the prophets*, for more than is written therein, is not

the law and the prophets approve ; whom the Saviour and his apostles had as an heir of the heavenly inheritance ; why should such a master be up'raided as "*a monster, who in art and wickedness exceeds the Prince of darkness?*" And why should his slave be told, it matters not what is written in the Law and the Prophets, nor what the Saviour and his apostles may have said about slavery, "*your master, who claims your child as his property and nurtures and detains it in slavery, is equally a man thief with the negro stealer on the coast of Guinea.*" Whence the authority for such outrageous declarations ? Has another STAR indeed appeared in the EAST, ominous of a more merciful dispensation to the slave, than that which was seen in Bethlehem of Judea?—and moving alternately o'er the dwellings of TAPPAN and GARRISON and thence in its marvelous revolutions pursuing HEMAN on his holy embassy across the Deep with his "*image of Jesus*, the price of his slaves in his pocket,"* have the Angels of heaven proclaimed with louder acclamations of joy than saluted the Shepherds of Israel, LO!!! THESE, THESE are the friends of the slave, and not the Saviour and his Apostles ? Frail humanity—thou must be prone to the most appalling presumption, when thy children measure arms with Jehovah, and extol *their* benevolence above the standard of *his* mercy.

* The Rev. Dr Nathan S. S. Beman in one of his Philippics against slavery remarked, that "slave-owners sold the image of Jesus in their poor slaves and carried the price in their pockets." Before he left Georgia, he sold *his poor slaves* and pocketed the price—and it is said that if ever he did an act that was more acceptable to his maker, he certainly never did one that was so acceptable to his slaves. He is gone to Europe to negotiate a railway in the holy war against slavery. Quer— is he a creek out of his Benjamin Maudslowi, or of the Portico, or of both ? And the Ottoman Court affable and propitious to his benevolent purposes, he will doubtless meet with a gracious reception there.

If by presenting our argument in this point of view, we should unfortunately trespass on the sensibility of those who would suggest a happier method to illustrate the *absurd* and *impious* opinions of our most deadly foes, we cannot help it; we have not been favoured with the counsel of such friends, nor do we know that *justice* and *truth* would have permitted us to heed their admonitions. There is such a thing as charity, and it is said that in the measure of its long suffering and kindness, "it beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things;" that "it envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity." We admire the apostles inimitable picture of the virtue, and would be extremely happy to believe that we possessed it in all the loveliness of its *true* character; but that *charity* which "*envieth*" the prosperity of others — that "*vaunteth itself*" above all virtue — that is so "*puffed up*" as to exalt itself above God and his holy precept — that "*behaveth itself*" so unseemly" as to curse those whom the Saviour and his apostles have blessed — that "*seeketh her own*" prosperity and happiness with such intense desire, as to forget the poverty and wretchedness of those around it — that is so "*easily provoked*" as to excite others to wrath and vengeance for no cause — so "*thinketh evil*" of its neighbor as not to discover one virtue in his heart — so "*rejoiceth in iniquity*" as to be comforted with nothing less than the tears and blood of the innocent — from such charity, "good Lord deliver us;" and if that be its voice which bids us "*bear all these things*

with meekness and patience — “believe” that they were initiated into the grand strategy — “they are the illusions of gross humanity — delusions” — “there is a war here a thousand times more grievous to be borne,” it is the heaven-born charity, never did our Fathers hear its voice, and never do we desire to hear it; for its long sufferings Redeem us, and its kindness, Protects.

That the institution of Bondage was written with the finger of God, and sanctioned by the Law our and his Apostles, is a fact as clearly proven in the Bible as the creation of the world; and he who affirms that “it is an unjust, cruel institution,” is either ignorant of the Scriptures or guilty of the most appalling presumption. God is not unjust; he cannot be cruel; nor is injustice and cruelty marked in the institutions of his word or the dispensations of his providence. He created man a pure, intelligent spirit, free to choose good or evil. The latter was unhappily his choice, and that choice constituted him an heir of *mortality*, entailing on his posterity its numberless ills. It was then that the compassionate eye of his Creator was specially directed to his condition: and when he beheld his posterity already oppressed with the cares of poverty and want — “when the children and sucklings swooned in the streets; when they cried for bread, and no man gave it unto them,” then did he institute Bondage as the means of affording protection and succour to those who were destitute of both; not to augment the miseries of the poor, but to save them from greater calamities; not as a license for *injustice* and *cruelty*, for *revenge*, with her own right hand inducing *laws*, and *justice*, with the seat of Heaven stamping its *penalties*. —

That the institution has been abused and its laws most cruelly violated in many instances, we do not deny; but this is neither the proof of its injustice and cruelty, nor of the accountability of its author or its abuses. For if its abuses be received as evidences of its injustice and cruelty, the same may be said of Christianity whose history is marked with darker features of moral depravity than bondage itself—and if God be accountable for the abuses of *one*, he is equally accountable for the abuses of the *other*; and if accountable for *both*, “then is the just God, whose justice” is said to be “the habitation of his throne;” “whose mercy is great unto the heavens and who has reserved the unjust and cruel man unto the day of Judgment to be punished”—then is that just and moral being the author of that injustice and cruelty, which he is bound by his holy word to punish in the day of judgment. It is not true—God is not the author of the injustice and cruelty which is marked in the history of slavery. To man belongs the guilt, the guilt of having violated the laws of a moral institution, which, with all its abuses, has proven a blessing to millions of the human race and afforded protection and succour to millions of others, who would otherwise have fallen victims to the sword or famine.

Bondage was originally a compact between the master and the slave, based upon the principle of mutual benefit and sanctioned by the Law of God. The morality of that law we have defended against the insidious attacks of the Abolitionists. Still we have no other law imposing bondage on the posterity of man, which, though stamped with the

seal of human depravity, is nevertheless an additional proof of its having deteriorated the condition of millions even in its worse state. History informs us that all nations of antiquity, the Israelites not excepted, regarded the privilege either to *kill* or *enslave* their prisoners, as a right secured to them by the laws of war. The Gubcomtes were enslaved by the special order of Joshua; the Assyrians and Babylonians followed the example, and Sardanapazar and Nebuchadnezzar with all their evil propensities, preferred rather to enslave the tribes of Israel than destroy them. The Phœnicians and Carthaginians were governed by the same motives, and the Grecians, Trojans and others continued the habit of enslaving their captives. Thus when Julius Cæsar had closed his invasion against Britain, he transported his prisoners to Rome and sold them as slaves, sooner than put them to the sword. Paulus Æmilius also transported 150,000 after the siege of Epirus; and it is said that when Augustus Cæsar had conquered the Salisians his noble spirit prompted him to inflict the mildest punishment on his captives that the laws of war would permit, and he accordingly sold them as slaves. In Africa also, where the horrors of war have been extended so far that it was customary for kings and princes to statch their huts and walls with the bones of their captives, bondage with all its "moral iniquity," has been the means of transporting millions who would otherwise have fallen victims to the barbarity of man. And would it indeed have been better for those who were brought to the South to have been buried in Africa or held there in bondage to more cruel masters? We cannot look at the history of the

African slave trade and mark with patience the part which the Abolitionists and their followers performed in that tragic scene. "It can't be attached to the crime of transporting the persons of Africa from the home of their fathers," to their tribulations, and labor to us.* In 1720, a Dutch vessel under authority from the British Government, brought the first Africans to the United States and sold them as slaves in Virginia. From that period the trade was continued under the sanction of his Britannic Majesty, until millions had been imported within his dominions. In 1776, South Carolina, that native state of patriotism, virtue and disinterestedness, passed an act in her colonial capacity interdicting the Trade in her ports. *Old England*, by the voice of her Royal spirits spurned the act, and *New England*, by the voice of her compassionate sons responded, our ships are laden and ready for the Traffic. Thus was the trade continued; and so long as they could garner their Ruin for "*the poor sons of Africa*," it was an act of humanity to man them in the liberty boats of their ships in such crowds, as to crush hundreds to perdition on the way "*from the home of their fathers*"—but when they can no longer be benefited by the traffic, when they

* In the debate on the Missouri question, a Senator from South Carolina in reference to the Senate of the United States, a document from the Custom House at Charleston exhibiting the names and owners of vessels engaged in the African slave trade. In reading the document, the name of the *White* was repeatedly called out. It was the senator from Rhode Island, was present, and said, "it is remarkable." The Carolina Senator was asked to object—"or cry, or cry," echoed through the Senate Hall, "it is contrary to order to call the name of a Senator," said a senator from Connecticut. The senator objected that he was not out of order, for the senator from Rhode Island had not been identified and consequently was not entered on the roll—he appeared on the Chair; the Chair replied, "you are correct, sir, proceed," and proceeded to call the name of De Wadsworth that before he had finished he called out in our province the honored name of a supporter of coercion is of the "Poor Africans" brought to the Charleston market, and the high the Missouri Restrictionists, the residents, the Rhode Island Abolitionists became the majority of the Senators and the sneers of the abolitionists. "It is contrary to order to call the name of a Senator." RESTRICTIONISTS AND ABOLITIONISTS. "THEY ARE CORRECT, SIR, PROCEED." THE RECEPTION OF THE TREASONABLE PETITIONS OF THE ABOLITIONISTS—"O, TEMPORA—O, MORSES."

see "the poor wretches" whom they sold in rags and savage apparel, clothed and nurtured in the principles of Christianity, then is discovered "a cloud of vengeance ready to pour its streams of fire on our beloved country because of the bonds of the poor slaves" whom they brought in fetters from the coast of Africa. "something must be done to avert this awful calamity," says one; "we must wage an exterminating war against the accursed sin of slavery," cries the holy priest, with the price of his slaves in his pocket—"yes, we must send an ambassador to the Throne of His Britannic Majesty to negotiate an alliance in the holy warfare," says another godly priest, "for if our Republic cannot stand but upon the necks of two millions of my fellow beings—let it fall, let it fall, though I be crushed beneath it." * Pious souls!!! could they prevail on the noble friends of Liberty and of the Union at the North, to heed their admonitions, how soon would we realize the horrors of a civil war.

These *compassionate* friends of these "two millions of fellow beings" desire to have them exported to "the beloved home of their fathers," and Parker in his travels in Africa, informs us that there is no section of the Globe which exhibits such appalling pictures of slavery as this beloved home of their fathers, nor is there a country to be found where liberty is less valued or suspended on more tortuous circumstances. There the fate of war seals the destiny of the captive, and if we add famine, says he, to the unceasing and bloody conflicts which prevail throughout Africa, these constitute the painful and endless sorrows of that cruel bondage.

* See the Rev. Mr. May's *Lectures on the Abolition of Slavery*.

with which millions of its inhabitants are oppressed. During the years of scarcity which frequently occur, great numbers are seen surrendering their *liberty* to save their lives; and as large families are generally the more exposed to absolute want, it is not uncommon to see children sold by their parents to purchase provisions for the rest of the family. Bruce in his travels in Africa, also testifies to the truth of these statements, and gives the most appalling picture of its walking skeletons, and of the lawless rapine which every where prevail during those years of scarcity. To export our slaves to such a country where misery abounds, and where life and liberty are suspended on the whims of savage kings, may be an act of the *kindest charity* in the estimation of the *benevolent* Abolitionists, but in the opinion of their masters, it would be such an act of *inhumanity* as would have brought upon the slave owners of Ephesus and Colosse, the reprobation of the Saviour and his Apostles.

We will now proceed to examine the practicability of the *schemes* which have been devised by the compassionate friends of our slaves for their emancipation and to present them in the most favorable point of view, we will suppose that their holy ambassador had returned from his Majesty's kingdom with the glad tidings of a happy revolution of the laws of *nature* and *barbarism* in Africa—that the Apocalyptic Angel of Mercy had visited the country and at his appearance *disease* and *rapine* hid their ghastly faces and the din of war and rumours of wars had ceased to be heard—that he produced credentials of the fact, under the seal of his royal Majesty and witnessed by the sainted

Thompson—that he also produced testimonials from the Queen of Spain stating that through her agency the Court of Madrid had formed an alliance with the republics of South America, to which was appended their most solemn asseverations, that the annual importation of 100,000 Africans within their dominions should now and forever stand, and if “*the Southern kidnappers*” would consent to have their slaves exported to Africa, not a hair of their heads should be touched—under such auspicious circumstances, we will suppose that they assent to the proposition provided they be paid a reasonable price for their slaves, and that the Government and the Abolitionists agree to the terms—now let us see whether their united energies will be adequate to the task of exporting them to “*the home of their fathers.*” The number of slaves in the United States is estimated at 2,400,000—the average price could not be less than 300 dollars—add to this the expense of *transportation* and *support* until they could clear and cultivate a sufficiency of land to support themselves, 100 dollars more; this increases the price of each slave to 400 dollars—2,400,000 slaves would therefore cost the General Government and the Abolitionists 960,000,000 of dollars. Notwithstanding many princely fortunes may be found among the followers of Tappan, we fancy that before one tenth of that amount was paid, there would be such a *scarcity* of cash in their pockets and of ‘*spills*’ in the Treasury, as to produce more doleful lamentations in Congress than were ever uttered there for the fate of our slaves.

But it is said by some, “we do not propose to export

them immediately—the work must be gradual.” Professor Dew in his learned and masterly review of the debate in the Virginia Legislature on this subject, has proven with mathematical accuracy the impossibility of effecting the object even in this way. The annual increase of our black population is at least 100,000, and this number is proposed to be sent off, so as to prevent an increase of the original stock. Here is at once the enormous sum of 40,000,000 of dollars to be paid annually, and at the expiration of a hundred years, the original stock of 2,400,000 would remain to be exported. And “long, *very long*, says Professor Dew, before the colony in Africa could receive even the *increase* of this accumulating capital, its recipient would be checked by the limitation of territory and the rapid filling up of the population, both by emigration and natural increase. King Canute the Dane, seated on the sea shore and ordering the rising flood to recede from his royal feet, was not guilty of more vanity and presumption than the Government of the United States would manifest, in the vain effort of removing and colonizing the annual increase of our blacks. So far from doing it, they would not be able to send off a number sufficiently great to check even the *geometrical rate of increase*.” The colony in Liberia, after all the efforts of its friends for nearly twenty years, contains perhaps, not more than 3000 inhabitants; and the Rev. Mr. Bacon, one of its most zealous supporters, declared in a speech before the Colonization Society, that “the additional number of 1000 landing at once, might ruin the colony.” Again, we are told by Mr. Ashmun, the friend and agent of the colony,

that "rice does not grow spontaneously in Liberia, and laborious *men* accompanied *only* with their natural proportion of inefficients must be sent there, lest the inhabitants be reduced to want"—and he further advises that "inefficient laborers should *be kept in America* where they can do something by picking out cotton or stemming tobacco, towards supporting themselves." Thus we see with all the fine things that have been told us of that "*Asylum of Liberty*"—it is no place for such slaves as can *only* pick out cotton and stem tobacco, nor is there *space* nor *means* within its borders, for the support of one-ninetieth part of the annual increase of our slaves.

If with these facts we take into consideration the mortality which has always attended the settlement of Colonies, we will at once perceive the *benovolence* of the scheme of colonizing the blacks. Professor Dew remarks that one of the greatest attempts at colonization in modern times, was the effort of the French to plant 12,000 emigrants on the coast of Guiana. The consequence was, that in a very short time 10,000 of them lost their lives in all the horrors of despair—2,000 returned to France—the scheme failed and 25,000,000 of Francs, says Raynal, were totally lost. Seventy five thousand christians, says Mr. Eaton in his account of the Turkish Empire, were expelled by Russia from the Crimea and repaired to the country deserted by the Nogai Tartars—and in a few years 7,000 only remained. In like manner if 100,000 Negroes with careless and filthy habits were annually sent off to the insalubrious clime of Africa, what would be their fate? In 1787 the British planted a Colony

of negroes in Sierra Leone—The *intemperance* and *imprudence* of the emigrants brought on a mortality which reduced the number nearly one half the first year, and after a lapse of twenty years, their rights and possessions were surrendered to the British Crown. During the brief period of its existence, says Mr. Dew, “it has been visited by all the plagues that Colonial establishments are heir to. It has been cursed with intemperance, desertion, civil wars and insurrections. It has experienced famines, and suffered insult and pillage. Its numbers have been thinned by the blighting climate of Africa, and it has been continually engaged in wars with the neighboring African tribes”—Colombia and Gautemala have tried the dangerous experiment of Colonization, and Mr. Dunn has given the following picture of the latter—“With a colored population drunken and revengeful, her females licentious, and her males shameless, she ranks as a true child of that accursed city which still remains as a living monument of the fulfilment of prophecy and of every unclean and hateful bird. Not a day passes without murder—on fast days and on Sundays, the average number killed is from four to five. From the number admitted in the Hospital of St. Juan de Dios in the year 1827 near 1500 were stabbed, of whom from three to four hundred died.” With these and many other instances of the hazardous schemes of Colonization which stand in “bold relief” before the eyes of the compassionate Abolitionists, they seem determined to wage a perpetual warfare against the happy condition of our slaves.

But we had almost forgotten to mention another of

their *benevolent* schemes. Some have suggested the plan of "*taking off the breeding portion of the slaves to Africa, or carrying away the sexes in such proportions as will in a measure prevent those left behind from breeding:*" All these plans says Professor Dew, "merit nothing more than the appellation of *vain juggling conceits*, unworthy of a moral man. If our slaves are to be sent away in any systematic manner, humanity demands that they should be sent in families. The voice of the world would condemn us if we sanctioned any plan of deportation by which the male and female, husband and wife, parent and child, were systematically and relentlessly separated." If the compassionate feelings of the Abolitionists prompt them to choose this method to regulate "*the moral evil of slavery*" they had better adopt the plan suggested by the learned Professor, of keeping the male and female separate in *ergastula* or dungeons, and then when one generation will pass away, the *moral evil* will cease of itself—leaving them the pleasing reflection of being sustained in the *humane and merciful scheme* of its destruction, if not by "the Scriptures of the New Testament," at least by the counsel of Xenophon in his *Economics* and the practice of Cato and Censor.

With this brief view of the impracticability of the schemes of emancipation, we beg leave to remark that from the days of the Patriarchs to the present period, whether from choice, necessity or misfortune, at least two thirds of mankind have been working for the rest ; and whether they toil in the capacities of hirelings or bond-servants, so long as man is clothed with mor-

tality, this state of things will exist. Now the question occurs, which state is best adapted to the capacities and wants of the negro? To ascertain this important point of our argument, we must resort to comparisons. We have already spoken of the wretched condition of the colonists in Sierra Leone and Guatemala, and if we add the free blacks of Hayti to the number, the aggregate amount of their miseries will be diminished but little. And who cannot perceive that *their* condition is infinitely worse than the slaves of the most cruel owners? But we will not confine our comparison to persons of their own color and habits---In England, Ireland, Wales and Scotland, where it is said the benign influence of christianity has driven domestic slavery "to a more savage' clime," the generous and benevolent lords of the soil exact such exorbitant rents from the Peasantry as to compel much the larger portion of them to feed all the year on oatmeal and potatoes and frequently without salt—and when bowed under the weight of years and infirmity, they are exported either to the "land of slavery" to be fed by the hand of charity, or suffered to pine under the griping pangs of hunger, in "the land of Liberty" In Poland the fate of the laboring class is still worse, and it should not be forgotten that their miseries have been increased since their personal liberty was granted them. Through the agency of Stanislaus Augustus, that boon was conferred in 1791, and so far from its proving a blessing to the peasantry, it has proven a curse, both with regard to its influence on their morals and their means of subsistence. They are in fact still slaves, says Burnett in his view

the present state of Poland, and relatively to their political existence, as absolutely subject to the will of their lords, as in all the barbarism of the feudal times. In China millions of freemen are said to taste no *wholesome* meat throughout the whole of the toilsome year---frequently see their families perishing before their eyes---seek with eagerness the vilest garbage from the river or canal and voraciously devour meat which our negroes would cast to the dogs and vultures of the air. And will any man affirm that the *bondage* of our slaves is not more than equivalent to the *liberty* of such freemen? But let the contrast be brought even nearer home---thousands at the North, who having toiled all their lives in the service of the landholders and manufacturers for no more than a meagre support, are doomed in the evening of their days to beg a morsel in the Streets and Highways---And is not their condition infinitely worse than the bondage of our slaves who are daily supplied with bread, meat, and vegetables, and frequently with milk and refreshing drinks? But the other day, we saw a lady of refinement making with her own hands a comfortable bed for an old slave who told her that his mattress was too hard to afford him comfortable sleep. For his owners, who are in very moderate circumstances, he has not toiled an hour for many years, and their children vie with each other for the privilege of waiting on "DADDY" with his meals, consisting of meat, bread and coffee, and such other articles of food as their table affords. Nor are such instances uncommon in the slave-holding States---the slave who is bowed under the weight of years and infirmity is the

favorite of every humane family—and it should not be forgotten, that the anticipation of being overtaken by age and infirmity without a penny in our pockets or a friend to minister to our wants, constitute the summary of that care and anxiety with which millions of freemen are oppressed, and from which our slaves are relieved.

“*But they grow under bondage—perpetual bondage, and who,*” says the Abolitionist, “*can bear the thought of perpetual bondage?*” These abstract and vindictive remarks have been uttered with as little regard for the history of man as for the precepts of the Bible. It is a fact as notorious as the divinity of the Scriptures, that the merciful Creator of the universe has implanted in the bosom of man a *principle of contentment*, which if not disturbed by avarice or some rebellious spirit, never fails to produce that resignation to his *condition* and the dispensations of Providence, which is essential to his present and future happiness. But for the influence of this moral principle, “*godliness with contentment*” would be driven from the cottages of the virtuous poor—the missionary would exchange the toils and privations of his beggarly life, for a more lucrative occupation—and our slaves would long ago have heeded the counsel of their compassionate friends and imbrued their hands in the blood of their owners. The existence of this principle is not only essential to the peace of society but to all the operations of honesty and benevolence; and that *chirity* which supposes that the slave under its moral influence is capable of estimating liberty so high, as to render life intolerable, has neither history

nor scripture to support it. Greece and Rome have furnished many instances of persons distinguished for learning and talents, who were so governed by this law of *contentment* as to be happy in bondage.—Epictetus, Terence, Æsop and Phœdrus were slaves; Daphnis the Grammarian was a slave, and Roscius the actor, whose talents it is said, permitted him to gain annually for his master upwards of 17,000 dollars, was also a slave. Thus we see that the minds of men have not all been cast in one common mould—for while some prefer *death* to *bondage*, others like the Gibeonites prefer to be “hewers of wood and drawers of water unto all the congregation of Israel,” sooner than perish by the sword of Joshua.*

Nor does this variety of human opinions end here, for we find that from the days of the Patriarchs to the present period, some have even preferred *bondage* to *liberty*, and so far from the act being repugnant to the will of Heaven, it has received the special approbation of Deity—“And God spake these words, saying—If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.—If his master has given him a wife, and she has borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her masters, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: Then his master shall bring him unto the Judges; he shall also bring him unto the door, or unto the post of the door; and his master shall bore his ear through with

* See Joshua, Chapter 9,

an awl ; and he shall serve him forever."* Thus we see instances of men preferring *bondage* to *liberty*, even among the Israelites. But how do these precepts of the Almighty Arbiter of the universe accord with the *divinity* of the Abolitionists ? Most wretchedly—for according to the opinions of their most holy and learned Divines, the master of the Hebrew—*“who nurtured and detained his children in bondage was as verily a kidnapper as if he had stolen them from the coast of Guinea”*—and not to upraid him as *“a base, criminal monster”* unworthy of the esteem of his servant—not to threaten him with *“Heaven’s deepest, vengeful curse”*—and not to denounce slavery as *“a moral evil—a curse to the poor—and a disgrace to christianity”*—not to do at least *so much* for the comfort of the poor Hebrew slave, was such *“an outrage on the principles of philanthropy”* as *their* tender consciences cannot endure. But as the beneficent Creator was not an Abolitionist, his compassion would neither permit him to order the Israelite to emancipate his slaves, nor to denounce him as *“a kidnapper”* for *“nurturing and detaining them in bondage”*—and as the Hebrew loved his master, his wife and his children, and preferred bondage to liberty, he indulged him in his choice, not only because it was congenial to his feelings, but because INFINITE WISDOM perceived that its condition was better adopted to his capacity and his wants.

Similar instances have frequently occurred in the Southern States, and we recollect to have been present at the appraisement of an estate of a wealthy

* Genesis 20 Chapter 1, and 21 Chapter 2, 6.

Planter, where a scene occurred which would have afforded the benevolent advocates of emancipation but little comfort. The master of that estate had been in the habit of giving his negroes a portion of land to cultivate, the proceeds of which were applied to their own purposes. A slave as remarkable for his intelligence and morality, as for his industry and frugality, was appraised at a sum not equivalent to the treasure of his chest. A gentleman aware of the fact observed to him, "well uncle Tom, you have now an opportunity of appropriating your funds to the purchase of your freedom—no, no, Sir, said Tom—I've no desire to part with Mistress and my young Masters, especially at this time—and I don't know, Sir, what I'd gain by buying myself—for if I was to buy myself, I'd have to take care of myself, and if I don't buy myself, Mistress and my young Masters will have to take care of me." This remark induced the gentleman to ask him why he had been so careful of his money if he wished not to apply it to that purpose? To this he readily replied—"why Sir, my Master who I know is gone to Heaven, always gave me a plenty of food and clothes, and I had no occasion to spend it—and as I've seen some folks rich one year, and poor next, I thought I'd keep it, and if ever *time* *lot* fell to my Master, I'd give it to him if I was'nt too old to work, and if I was, I'd live on it and save him the expense of supporting me in my old age—and now he's dead and gone, I feel like doing all I can for Mistress and the children, and I'll keep it for the same purpose." Such instances are not uncommon among the slaves of the Southern States—indeed

there is not a farm or plantation of a humane Master which affords not similar evidences of their sincere esteem for their owners. Out of the bosom of his own family, the kind master finds no friends who feel a more lively interest in his prosperity and happiness than his slaves—in health, it is their pleasure to promote his welfare—in sickness, they are his constant and sympathizing attendants, and at his grave, their tears and lamentations evince the sincerity of their affections, in terms which can neither be described nor forgotten. And do not such instances prove that there is nothing in the condition of bondage calculated to mar the peace of the slave?

However repugnant the assertion may be to the feelings of the Abolitionists, there is not to be found among the laboring class of freemen in any quarter of the habitable Globe, such a proportion of cheerful happy beings as our slaves; and if the mad and brutal scheme of exporting them "*to the home of their fathers*" were now to be executed, their tears and lamentations would require hearts stouter than "Southern Kidnappers" to witness the scene. And why should their happiness be marred by the voice of an evil spirit? Why should they be persuaded to murmur at the lot which a merciful Providence assigned their fathers as the means of alleviating their cares and their wants, and the cares and wants of their posterity? Why should the most brutal and unceasing efforts be made to alienate their affections for their owners, who are indeed their best and only friends and protectors?—One of the deepest and most deadly schemes of insurrection that was ever devised in the

South, originated with the poor deluded Blacks of Camden, who were persuaded that their condition was similar to the Israelites when oppressed by Pharoah, and if in the name of Israel's God they would make an effort, he would miraculously deliver them from bondage. Under the influence of this base and delusive suggestion, their meetings for the execution of their bloody purposes, were opened and closed with prayer. The plot was disclosed—its deluded leaders were hung, and their more guilty accomplices escaped the Gallows. The same doctrine is now preached, and in despite of the sacred and constituted authorities of God and our Country, it has been affirmed again, and again, as the truth of Heaven. Our motives—our principles—our humanity—our morality and our patriotism are assailed with relentless and unceasing fury. Members of the same confederacy—followers of the same Lord, are the agents of these satannic deeds---and with an effrontery that bids defiance to *truth* and *modesty*, they have attributed that *forbearance* which rests upon the conscious integrity of our principles and the affections of our slaves, “*to a servile fear of realizing their vengeance.*”

Should the question be asked, why are “*holy men*” thus busy in the Devil's work? The answer is at hand---it is to effect a dissolution of the Union under the specious guise of philanthropy. No other reason can be assigned; for with the most conclusive evidences of the fact, that bondage is peculiarly adapted to the comfort and happiness of the negro, they have assailed the institution, with a recklessness and malice, more in character with the Huns of Barbary, than

with the spirit of christianity. By one class, the word of God is rejected for the impurity of its precepts, and by others, it is perverted to the purposes of their rebellious schemes.

“If usages sanctioned in the Old Testament,” says an eminent divine,” and not forbidden in the New, are right then our moral code will undergo a sad deterioration ; for Polygamy was allowed to the Israelites, and was common and *licensed* in the age of the Apostles.”* In the name of truth and morality we ask, how can “holy men” publish such barefaced falsehoods! Where in the writings of the Immaculate Saviour and his Apostles is POLYGAMY justified? And where is the authority for the following words of the Rev. Gentleman---“why therefore may not Scripture be used to stock our houses with WIVES as well as with SLAVES!” Well may “humanity blush” at such outrageous declarations. The pious and learned author well knows, that the Saviour and his Apostles have no where told us, how “an *adulterer*” can live in the crime of adultery, and go to Heaven---how a “*blasphemer*” can live in the act of blaspheming, and go to Heaven---how “a Liar and a *thief*” can live in the act of lying and stealing, and go to Heaven---but they have told us how “*slave owners*” may live in what the Rev. Gentleman calls “the accursed sin of slavery” and be numbered with “the Saints and faithful Brethren” of Ephesus and Colosse, at the right hand of God.

These specious and impious declarations but too

* See the Rev. Dr. Channing's work on Slavery, page 118, the right of which we were not favored with until we had proceeded thus far with our work.

clearly prove the position we have assumed. They exhibit the deadly influence of prejudices which have been nurtured for many years, and which now threaten to crush the temple of liberty and drench our country with the blood of the innocent. In the illustration of this fact, the kindest feelings of our hearts are brought in contact with *duty*. We revere the ashes of the dead—we revere the names, we esteem the characters of the holy men of whom we are about to speak, as cordially as do their dearest friends, and we rejoice to believe, that having seen and repented of their fallacious opinions of bondage, they are now reaping the reward of their pious and unparalleled labours in the vineyard of the Lord; but duty, imperious duty to our country impels us to advert to events in their lives, which our inclination would fain withhold.

Many years ago the venerable Bishops Coke and Asbury published a pamphlet on slavery which compelled the enlightened and benevolent Legislature of South Carolina to pass an act authorizing any persons to repair to Methodist meetings and disperse the negroes, whether assembled with or without the permission of their owners. The act was justified by the first law of nature, *self-defence*, and based upon the fact, that Methodism at that period, whether at the North or in the South was identified with the most deadly opposition to slavery. It continued in force, (and with the utmost propriety too,) until the ministers of that denomination ceased to assail the institution of bondage, and to expel the members of their societies for buying and selling a negro under any circumstan-

ees. But the spirit of Abolitionism thus arrested in the South, was still cherished in the North. Immediately after the discussion of the Missouri question which convulsed the Union, a resolution was introduced in the General Conference to expel the members of the church who would not emancipate their slaves. The discussion was conducted with great asperity, and ended without a dissolution of the union of the societies, with the utmost difficulty. A few years after this, the General Conference received a letter from the British Conference by the hand of their delegate, the Rev. Mr. Reese, desiring an interchange of visits as brethren of one name and household, and tendering copies of their theological works for their press. The delegate was cordially greeted, and a resolution passed, directing the Bishops to elect and send a delegate to the ensuing British Conference in London. They met at the time and place appointed and balloted again, and again, Bishops McKendree and Soule, voting for a Southern, and Bishops Hedding and George for a Northern delegate—the former contending for their favorite on the score of pre-eminent qualifications, and the latter esteeming it an outrage to send a slave-owner in the robes of a minister to “the land of liberty,” refused to vote for him. They adjourned without making an election, and at the ensuing General Conference, the slave-owner was elected, receiving but one vote North of the Potomac. At the last General Conference, the same spirit of hostility prevailed so far as to exclude a slave-owner from the Episcopal office, and though Resolutions were passed, disapprobating the course of the Abolitionists, those Resolu-

tions, like the INAUGURAL of Mr. Van Buren, had one word too many to disprove our position, or check the career of the bloody host. * They were introduced with the words, "we disapprove of MODERN abolitionism," an implication as clear as mathematical demonstration, that they approved of ANCIENT abolitionism; and if there be any difference between *ancient* and *modern* abolitionism, save the abstract question of ways and means to effect both, we have yet to discover it. This was evidently the construction placed on the Resolutions by the Northern Ministers, as we are informed several of them have since become members of the Abolition Society. Quite in character with these Resolutions was the address of Bishops Hedding and Emory to the Ministers of the New-Hampshire Conference. It contained the kindest expressions of concern for the peace and safety of their brethren in the South, while on its front was impressed the sweeping declaration "neither the New-Testament Scriptures, nor the preaching and practice of our Lord and his Apostles were ever designed to justify slavery." This being the corner stone of the great Abolition Temple, the address was hailed as a license for seven-

* Mr. Van Buren in his Inaugural, pledged himself not to give his CONSTITUTIONAL sanction to any Bill conflicting with the institution of slavery. Why was the word CONSTITUTIONAL prefixed to his substantive, but to render the sentence more ambiguous and less explicit? We wish it had been EXPUNGED, for the President is quite lawyer enough to know, that no Bill conflicting with the domestic institutions of the South can be CONSTITUTIONAL—nevertheless, should such an one be passed in accordance with the schemes and wishes of the Abolitionists, he has taken special care not to pledge himself to give it his UNCONSTITUTIONAL sanction. Why in the plain, simple words of honest endeavor, did he not tell us that no such Bill would ever receive his sanction—that he would put his VETO on it? Is there an orthodox Jeffersonian Republican, or a genuine friend of the South and of the Union, who could refuse to do so? Who but the Abolitionists, would have been offended at such a declaration?

ty of the ministers of that Conference to form an Abolition Society.* To these facts, we add the anti-slavery law in the moral code of the Church, which was annulled nearly thirty years ago, but carefully preserved and exhibited in every new edition of the Discipline, as a monument of the hostility of the Northern Methodists to the institution of bondage.

Let not the confinement of our remarks on this subject exclusively to the Methodists, be attributed to a want of respect or affection for them. Our dearest friends are Methodists—the kindest feelings of our hearts are with them—and were we shall refuse to share our last brown loaf with the way-faring Itinerant, who as he goes forth *sowing the seed of life* broadcast o'er the earth, takes care to let some fall by the door of the negro hut, we trust we shall cease to breathe. Our remarks have been exclusively applied to them, because we are intimately acquainted with the history of no other church. Facts quite as conclusive, can doubtless be deduced from others, and we have this day been informed by a very worthy and eminent minister of the Presbyterian denomination, that the Synod of Ohio have recently passed a resolution, abnegating all fellowship and communion with the Presbyterians of the South, who will refuse to co-operate with them in “the benevolent schemes of emancipation.” We have deduced the facts under an honest conviction of duty to our country, and we submit them as evidences of the deep rooted prejudices which have existed for more than half a century, against an institution, sanctioned by the word of God and the Constitution of the United States.

* See “the South vindicated from the Treason and Fanaticism of the Abolitionists” page 113.

And with such evidences of deadly hostility to the institution of slavery since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, why have its advocates refused to organize—why were not Abolition societies formed until about four years ago? Have our statesmen thought of this matter? Have they been perusing the vindictive essays of Northern Fanatics for the past fifty years, without an inquiry into the cause of their *recent efforts* in forming societies and rallying their forces? Have they asked themselves the question, why, long ere this, they made no efforts to exhibit their wealth, their talent, and their numbers, and to shake the temple of Liberty with the thunders of an embattled Host? These important questions, demand at this crisis, the most serious attention of every friend of the Union. There is a cause for the recent efforts of the Abolitionists; it should be thoroughly investigated; and that cause must be removed, or the effects of their bloody purposes will be realized, ere we expect them.

For our self, we have no hesitation in bringing our views before the public and the more so, because we cannot be personally benefitted by the act. Our sphere in life, is an humble one—we aspire to no other—we have sought no other—and before God and our country we say, that political honors or preferment are objects beneath our personal esteem; nevertheless we hope we shall cease to live, ere we cease to cherish the pure "*amor patriæ*" of a patriot. The ardor with which we have nurtured this principle, has frequently brought us in contact with our interest and our friends,

and in no one instance of our life has it been more painfully exemplified, than in the frank expression of our opinions of the doctrines of the memorable Proclamation and Force Bill. Hundreds, in whose hands we hope these pages may fall, heard us denounce them as doctrines that would move the Abolitionists to concert and action. In justification of this sentiment we stated that the deadly hostility of a Host against slavery, would have impelled them to concert and action long since. but the dread of the old Constitutional doctrine of State Sovereignty, which they now saw prostrated at the feet of the Chief Magistrate, quelled their rage. We spoke of the hostility of the Tariff men, of their jealous and deadly spleen, and predicted that they would immediately enlist a Clerical host to decry the institution of slavery, and crush the South under the weight of the Proclamation. We adverted to the fears of the illustrious Jefferson that the subject of slavery would one day be used as an engine of destruction to the Union, and but for the interposition of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, we would long ago have been assailed by enemies within our own borders, who dared not move in the face of those resolutions. We told them the die was now cast; those resolutions were now defunct; the states were now stripped of their Reserved Rights; they had neither the power to resist the enforcement of an unconstitutional law, nor to judge of their own greivances; they had delegated that power, together with their Sovereign Rights to their Agent, the General Government, and whatever the majority of Congress should say was Constitutional Law, the minority was bound

to submit to. These we maintained to be the plain, simple deductions of the Proclamation, deductions that would license the action of a rebellious spirit which had long been lurking in the bosom of our country; deductions that would sever the only bond which secured the perpetuity of the Union. We stated that General Jackson's construction of the powers vested in the Agent of the States, was perfectly in character with the views of the old Federalists who were members of the Convention which framed the Constitution; and in support of this fact we adduced the following Resolutions from the Journals of the Convention.

“Resolution of Mr. Charles Pinckney—Resolved that the Legislature of the United States have power to revise the laws of the several States, that may be supposed to infringe the power exclusively delegated by this Constitution to Congress, and to negative and annul such as do.”

“Resolution of Mr. Patterson—Resolved, if any State, or body of men in any State, shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution Acts, or Treaties of the Union, the Federal Executive shall be authorized to call forth the powers of the Confederate States, or so much thereof, as shall be necessary to enforce or compel the obedience to such acts, or observance to such treaties.”

“Resolution of General Hamilton—Resolved, that all laws of the particular States, contrary to the Constitution or Laws of the United States, be utterly void; and the better to prevent such laws being passed, the Governor or President of each state shall be appointed by the General Government, and shall have a negative on the laws about to be passed, in which he is Governor or President.”

“Resolution of Governor Randolph—Resolved, that the President of the United States be vested with power to negative all laws contrary, in the opinion of the National Legislature, to the articles of the Union, or any treaty subsisting under the authority of the Union; and to call forth the forces of the Union, against any member of the Union failing to fulfil its duty under the articles thereof.”

We stated that these resolutions were introduced in

the Convention for the special purpose of clothing the President of the United States with power *to do*, what General Jackson assumed the authority to do, *viz*—to strip the states of their Sovereign Rights and coerce their *submission* to the will of the General Government—and in the face of such resolutions, advocated by the Federalists of the old school and rejected by a large majority of the Revolutionary Republicans of the Convention, the General's arbitrary assumption of power could only be attributed to his *cordial approbation* of the exploded doctrines of the old Federalists and advocates of a consolidated despotism. We offered it as our opinion that Gen. Jackson was not the author of the Proclamation; that some artful advocate of the Tariff penned it, and we would soon see the baneful effects of its Anti-Republican principles. For these remarks made in the face of the foregoing resolutions, we were reviled and anathematized in epithets more profane than “an old Piney Woods traitor.” And now in view of the desolation with which our country is threatened, and in sight of all the horrors of a civil and servile war, we ask, not with feelings of exultation—no God forbid; we ask with emotions of deep heart-rending grief, who spoke the truth on this subject? We intreat our fellow citizens to look at the calamities with which our country is threatened, and impute the causes, if they can, to any thing but the doctrines of the Proclamation and Force Bill.

When the Proclamation was published, there was not an organized party of Abolitionists in the United States. At that time, they were sneered at as “a few

miserable fanatics." Who, says the Editor of "*Human Rights*" in his paper of the past year—

"Who does not remember the ridicule that was thrown upon the handful of Fanatics in Boston three years ago; upon the twenty-two men and two women in New-York, two years ago; upon the fifty or sixty men who met in Philadelphia a year and a half ago; what a fine joke it was that such a handful should meet to form an American Abolition Society? Now this same society numbers 250 Auxiliaries in 13 States. A few pens, a few tracts, a few periodicals, a few limited agencies have electrified the nation, and already stirred up a mighty Host to plead for the oppressed. Our cause is rapidly getting the supremacy; it has received accession of wealth, of talent, and of unconquerable zeal, that insures its speedy triumph."*

Rapidly indeed is their cause gaining ascendancy, for since the publication of this article 18 months ago, their organized associations have increased to 1006, comprising men of the most unconquerable zeal, and more wealth than our Revolutionary Fathers commenced their struggle with. "Fifty thousand copies of the most inflammable and treasonable matter are published weekly and gratuitously distributed, and a party have already proposed to have 20,000 followers in the City of New-York and nominate its Candidate for the Presidency of the United States."†

In the face of these facts and the innumerable evidences of the long cherished hostility of the Abolitionists to the institution of bondage, will any man

* See "*The South vindicated from the Treason and Fanaticism of the Northern Abolitionists*—page 171.

† See the same work page 73.

say they have not been *recently* impelled to action by some mighty *impetus*? And what but the doctrines of the Proclamation, have moved them to action? While they believed that the States would exercise their Reserved Rights in opposing any Act of Congress conflicting with their domestic institutions, they made no effort whatever to rally their forces and obtain ascendancy in Congress; but when the President announced the States subservient to the will of the National Legislature, and ordered his Frigates and Army to enforce an unrighteous and unconstitutional law, against which prayers and remonstrances had followed in succession for years, that day gave birth to schemes and purposes which now convulse the Union.

The fact cannot be denied that the Abolitionists are determined to gain the ascendancy in the Anti-slavery States and control the elective franchises of the same. For this purpose they have enlisted two hundred travelling agents, who go forth "conquering and to conquer." In addition to their treasonable pamphlets, they take with them

"Pictures of slaves in chains, with the negro's complaint in Poetry."

"Anti-Slavery Handkerchiefs, ornamented with four cuts and extracts from the Slave's Friend, printed with indelible ink."

"Anti-Slavery Seals, giving a fair impress of a slave in chains on sealing wax &c. &c. &c." *

In a work entitled "the South vindicated from the Treason and Fanaticism of the Northern Abolitionists" published in Philadelphia, these and such other facts are exhibited, as should make the advocates of the Proclamation and Force Bill, blush and weep.

* See "South Vindicated &c." page 197.

The work has been imputed to the pen of Col. Wm. Drayton, formerly of Charleston, South Carolina, but for the past four years a citizen of Philadelphia. Col. Drayton's character as a scholar, a statesman, a patriot and a "Union man," entitles the work to the confidence of every friend of the Union. It embodies 300 pages, from which we have already taken extracts and to which we beg leave to add the following.

"It is impossible that any reasoning man can contemplate the resources and activity of the Abolitionists and wonder at their progress. It is impossible that any patriot can view, in connection, their past success, their present energies and activity, and their future prospects, without coming to the conclusion; *that either this band of traitors must be crushed, or the Union abandoned.* They cannot exist together."

"Let the South look to it. We have already demonstrated that the advocates of abolition are neither few nor feeble; that they are wealthy, powerful and united: possessed of a number of influential presses; and led on by men whose intemperate zeal is only equalled by their untiring energy. Their strength is despised, because it is not known. Let him that takes an interest in this matter examine the open evidence of facts; let him observe the extended and insidious operation of Presses, Agents and Societies; let him mark the progress and results of these efforts for the last four years; and then if he is still secure, he may sleep on, until he is roused by the glare of the midnight conflagration, or startled by the whoop of the negro at the door of his chamber."

"A few years ago it was announced in the *Emancipator* "*slavery will never be abolished until it is done by THE SWORD* of the fear of *THE SWORD—the slaves will soon be free.*" This was then, and is now their policy. They cry *peace, peace*, but pursue a course which is designed to end and must end (unless the South erect herself and interpose the only shield which can ward off the blow,) in a servile war, and render the whole South a *Pandemonium*, from which the shout of exulting rapine, and the shriek

of murder and violence will go forth. We repeat, **THE ABOLITIONISTS MUST BE CRUSHED, OR THE UNION ABANDONED.**"

With these stubborn facts in the face of the world, and in the face of the Representatives of the people of the United States in Congress assembled, Mr. Wise of Virginia raised the all important question, whether any set of men had the right to petition the Government *to do* what the Constitution said *it could not do*, and *should not do*—in other words, whether the Abolitionists had the Constitutional Right to petition Government to take away the property of its citizens and to grant them license to create a servile war that must end in the dissolution of the Union. This question on which was suspended the very life-blood of Abolitionism and the salvation of the Union, roused the vindictive passions of the advocates of the Tarriff, the Proclamation, and Force Bill, who united and voted it down by a majority of 48.

Fellow citizens of the South, look to this matter. Your rights, your liberty, your all is at stake. It is not our purpose to enter the *arena* of political discussion, nor to offer you reasons why the party in the *minority* on the question of "*the right of Petition*," were classed with "the Catalines and Robespierres, Arnolds and Burrs of notorious villany"* for their honest opposition to the doctrines of the Proclamation and Force Bill, and why the said "Traitors" and opponents of the Proclamation and Force Bill, were the only opponents of the **TREASONABLE PRAYERS** of the Abolitionists. We leave this to those better quali-

* "See the Federal Union" December 1832 and others.

fied, to the statesmen of our country whose duty it is ; but we entreat you to examine “ the open evidence of facts ” which we lay before you—facts which have been deduced under an imperious sense of duty to God and our country, and which we would have rejoiced to have seen presented by some abler hand.

It is a truth, a most appalling incontrovertible truth, that the Abolitionists already wield a powerful influence in Congress—that they are determined to obtain the supremacy—then to pass a law of general emancipation—then to coerce the states to submission peaceably, if they can by the doctrines of the Proclamation and Force Bill, otherwise, by virtue of the sword. Mark the words of our own illustrious Drayton, “ *unless the South erect herself and interpose the only shield that can ward off the blow, ere long the shout of exulting rapine will go forth, and the shriek of murder and violence, be heard in Heaven.* ” Where is that *Shield*—the *shield of State Sovereignty*—to *Liberty* and the *Union*, the only “ *Helmet of Salvation?* ” Ask where it is ? where is that *shield* that is “ *to ward off the fatal blow?* ” and echo from the darkest page of your country’s Records will tell you, the Proclamation and Force Bill have torn from the States, the *sacred bequest* of our Fathers.—Behold members of one Confederacy, followers of one Lord, flocking to “ *the Banner of Liberty* ” on which is engraven the crimson motto, “ *Knell shall be tolled on Knell, Hearse follow Hearse, and Coffin rumble on Coffin, until the last surly slave-owner shall say to his slave depart to Africa the home of thy Fathers* ”—ask, why this embattled Host ? and they will tell you, go to the

Proclamation and Force Bill, and from them you shall learn that the citizens of a Sovereign State, at the peril of their lives, dare not arrest the enforcement of a law passed by a *majority* of Congress.

Alas! for those doctrines—those instruments of destruction to Constitutional Liberty. But thanks, unfeigned thanks to Heaven, the calamities with which they threaten us, are suspended for a season. Our country may yet be saved from the destroying “*Angels of Mercy*”—the South may yet be rescued from the vengeance of a “*Godly Host*.” She has friends in the North—friends who breathe the spirit of Liberty—friends who have been nurtured in the genuine principles of Jeffersonian State Sovereignty—friends who are ready to risk their all in defence of her Constitutional Rights and the *perpetuity* of the Union. Let her own sons be true to her honor and integrity, and all will yet be well. Let the voice of her rights and wrongs be heard throughout her borders, and let not her Priests refuse to respond. No—let them remember that when Adonijah usurped the dominion of Israel, and seized the treasures of the people, and feasted his minions, and threatened *proscription* and *halters* for all who refused to bow to his *will* and share his *spoils*, ZADOCK and NATHAN, “Priests of the living God,” were the first to call upon the Tribes of Israel to rise in the majesty of their Covenant Rights, and Israel’s Rights, and put down the Usurper.—Let the Standard of *State Sovereignty* be once more uplifted—let every man be determined that the South shall present one undivided, formidable front—that her Legislative Halls shall be filled with the ad-

vocates of the *Reserved Rights* of the States—that her Representatives in the next Congress shall be men, who will unite with her friends in the North, in restoring to the States their **SOVEREIGN POWERS**—then will the *prayers* and *anathemas* of our “*Godly*” enemies cease to be heard—then will our National maladies be healed, and our country once more free from the grasp of a despotic construction of her rights will again be hailed as “the pride of nations and the glory of the world.” But reverse the scene—fill her councils with the votaries of “*the right of Petition*”—“*the Sovereignty of the Government*”—and “*the subordination of the States*”—let these doctrines be maintained, and the day is not far distant, when the Abolitionists will enact a law, the enforcement of which will cause our cities to be demolished, our fields laid waste, and our rivers reddened with the blood of our wives and children.

FINIS.

ERRATUM.

Page 36, 11th line from top, for *distinction* read *distribution*.

